



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,815	07/22/2003	Scott D'Avanzo	5611.00003	7787
29747	7590	08/26/2005		
QUIRK & TRATOS 3773 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY SUITE 500 NORTH LAS VEGAS, NV 89109			EXAMINER COLLINS, DOLORES R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3711	

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Tulin

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/625,815

Applicant(s)

D'AVANZO, SCOTT

Examiner

Dolores R. Collins

Art Unit

3711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-10 and 16-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-10 and 16-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

Examiner acknowledges response by applicant's representative received 7/1/05.

Examiner further acknowledges the cancellation of claims 3 and 11-15.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-10 & 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slinkman (989) in view of Webb (307) and further in view of Johnson (094).

Slinkman discloses a Method Of Playing A Blackjack Game With A Modified Betting Arrangement.

Regarding claims 1, 6, 16, 18-19 & 23

Slinkman teaches a gaming table (see figure 1), accepting a first and second wager, conducting a wagering game and resolving the first wager according to conventional rules (see abstract). Slinkman teaches a pre-established outcome (i.e., if the dealers first two cards are a standing hand), but fails to teach a resolution of the pre-established outcome being made by activation a ball dispenser.

Webb (307) discloses a Gaming Device Having A Selection-Type Bonus Game That Activates A Mechanical Device. In his bonus game, Webb teaches that based on a predetermined selection, a mechanical device, containing balls, is activated which provides the player with a modifier that is used to determine his final award. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the game of Slinkman to include a mechanical ball-dispensing device to add excitement to the game.

Neither Slinkman nor Webb teach a ball dispenser that is incorporated on the gaming table that is electrically linked to activation means.

Johnson (094) discloses a Table Bonus Game. His game teaches a ball dispenser that is incorporated to the table and linked to a button (42) for activation purposes (see col. 6, lines 11-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Slinkman to incorporate a dispenser on the gaming table for ease and convenience in game play.

Regarding claims 2, 7-8, 17 & 20-22

Slinkman teaches that his game is blackjack (see abstract). He further teaches that that his game utilizes predetermined arrangements of cards in the dealer's hand to resolve the second wager and a predetermined arrangement in the player's hand compared with the dealer's hand for the conventional game.

Regarding claims 4-5 & 9-10

Slinkman fails to teach a device that uses balls as a multiplier.

In his bonus game, Webb teaches that based on a predetermined selection, a mechanical device is activated which provides the player with a modifier that is used to determine his final award. This modifier is a device with a selection of balls, which may be any indicia, symbol, or icon, which would include the limitations of these claims. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the game of Slinkman to include a mechanical ball dispensing device with any indicia dictating modifier since it would only modify the game design and add excitement to the game.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 7/1/05 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of a new rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure and are cited to show the state of art with respect to features of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ***Dolores R. Collins*** whose telephone number is ***(571) 272-4421***. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00 A.M. - 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ***Greg Vidovich*** can be reached on ***(571) 272-4415***. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is ***571-273-8300***.

Art Unit: 3711

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).



\*\*\*

8/19/05



**STEPHEN BLAU**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**